Attendees
Ken Smith - Team Co-Chair
Duncan Findlay - Team Co-Chair
Pasco Bakotich (absent)
Kirk Berg
Doyle Dilley (absent)
Richard (Rick) Door
Russ East (absent)
Mary Holland
Mike Horton (absent)
Mike Mariano
Keith Metcalf
Amir Rasaie
Lisa Reid (absent)
Rick Smith
John Villager
Karl Winterstein
Adele McCormick – Recorder

Guest Speakers:
Darlene Sharar, Added Access Point Decision Report (APDR)
Ron Pate, Lessons Learned Database

Introductions and Agenda Review
Duncan Findlay

The Change Recommendation Form has been translated from Excel into Word and is posted on the website. http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/partners/projectdelivery/proposals/

Added Access Point Decision Reports (*Design Manual* Section 1425)
Darlene Sharar

Handouts:
- Access Point Decision Report Process Timeline
- Access Point Decision Report (APDR) Discussion
- Access Decision Processes and Decision Making
- Access Point Decision Report (APDR) Assumptions
- Access Point Decision Report Assumptions: I-405 Congestion Relief and Bus Rapid Transit Projects

The team discussed the Access Point Decision Report (APDR) process timeline, from submittal of a draft APDR to Headquarters until the project Ad date.

Limited Access and Real Estate Services (RES) are tied together. How are the RES, Access, and Environmental processes related? How much can they overlap? You can proceed all the way through the APDR and be developing the environmental documents at the same time. The timeframe of projects produces a cyclic process as impacts change over time. The goal is to add Environmental along RES on the timeline and show what can we do and when can we do it.

When developing an APDR, answer the eight policy points for the report and then add backup information. Be succinct – we don't need volumes to answer the policy points, but there can be volumes of backup data.

FHWA still does an independent analysis to mimic the information we have gathered. Traffic analysis (just one piece of this) is repeated a number of times: consultant, region, Headquarters, and FHWA. The last thing the region does is the traffic data.

If the traffic data shows there is no impact to the mainline, we don't have to do a full-blown APDR. This allows for a much smaller document.

Direct access involves new interchanges, so they have to go to Washington, DC, for review. Flyer stops use the smaller document.

Consultants need to talk to someone about the floating issues on long duration projects not directly affecting an Interstate. Some of the issues are cloudy as to whether they need to be done – APDR is one of them.

Is the state NHS process any different than what is on the timeline and draft? That is a managed route, so it shouldn't have to have an APDR. Connections to state routes are regulated: limited access (Interstates are fully limited access); Managed Access program (MAP). MAP regulates the connections using a permitting process – it is based on speed – the higher the speed, the wider the connection points. SR 99 is a managed access route and doesn't need an APDR. You have to looked at the finished condition, not during construction, to determine if there is an impact on a freeway and if an APDR is needed.

The first screen is limited access – if it's not in limited access, it doesn't need an APDR.

The consultants need the preliminary information that shows what leads into the timeline. Real Estate Services can't start their process until the limited access process is done.

Use Chapter 1425! The information is there. Use chapter 1425 and contact Darlene's office before embarking on the APDR process.

Concurrency issues: RES, Environmental, and APDR – how do they relate and how can they overlap timelines?

Prior to completion of the process: early acquisition for willing sellers and total takes can be started before the APDR is done. Federal funding can be used if you can get FHWA to sign off on an early ROD (Record of Decision) when they have enough information (based on a risk assessment). Appraisals can be started early, but you can't go to condemnation. We can't do partial takes until the APDR and Findings and Order are done. We can't start on total takes without a ROD unless it is state funds only – in this state.

A suggestion was made to include a decision box at the front of the APDR timeline to determine whether or not the APDR timeline is even needed. Another suggestion is to include a simple statement in Chapter 1425, that "if it's not one of these, it's not necessary." Darlene will work on this.

Darlene's group makes sure the report is ready before it goes over to FHWA. According to the Stewardship Agreement, modifications to the Interstate cannot be delegated further.

A suggestion was made to work with Dan Mathis and others to discuss the necessity for a repeated in-depth review by FHWA. Gary Hughes could also add some value to this discussion.

Darlene is researching how our process compares with other states?

We can work on are our response to the regions and getting this moved on to FHWA. We can do the most good working on the blocks that we have control.

How much do local agency timelines skew this information? Is there a difference between how long a region-only project takes vs. one that we get from the local agencies? Workload issues in Darlene's office and FHWA drive some of this.

Let Darlene know if there are items that should be added to the Access Point Decision Report Assumptions document. The Access Decision Processes and Decision Making handout by Dean Moberg is a good document to use with groups that don't understand the process.

Team members who have personal experience with APDRs should contact Darlene with comments, questions, recommendations, etc.

Action Item: *Darlene Sharar will put APDR Steps for Success on the Access website: http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/eesc/design/access/ She will also add Chapter 1425 to the beginning of the APDR timeline so people know what is necessary to get to the timeline.*

Darlene is revising Chapter 1425, so this is a good time to put recommendations for improvements forward. The flowchart in the chapter needs revision. Fine tune the scope of what projects need to be dealt with; not "any" proposed project.

A suggestion was made for the team to address the right of way acquisition timeline also.

Things to look at: front end guidance; scoping; focus on concurrence with other processes; internal time that it takes things to turn around; local agencies, etc.

Lessons Learned Database
Ron Pate, WSDOT Innovative Project Delivery

Handout: Washington State Department of Transportation: Development of a Lessons Learned System

Ron Pate gave an overview of the Lessons Learned Database. The purpose of the database is to share knowledge and information across the Department. A lesson learned is information learned from experience; both what we did right and what we can improve on.

The database will eventually include what the lesson learned is, what action was taken, implementation, direction to policy changes, etc. If something is implemented, that will definitely be reflected in the system.

Lessons learned categories were taken out of PDIS. Over the first 6 months, categories are likely to change based on how they are used.

Project Delivery Method: Suggestion to add another bullet – "others."

There will be a lessons learned listserve. Due to issues with firewalls, system security, liability, etc., this database is going to be kept internal to WSDOT. We are trying to find opportunities to share with the outside world. There could be a website developed to inform consultants.

How can we gather information from the consultant community? There are different ways to work it – perhaps an e-mail form. ACEC could include information about this on the ACEC website. The Structures team has an interactive version of this that both internal and external customers can access. They include ACEC as one of the gatekeepers. Don't confuse that with this – they are two separate items. This is a different situation.

How do we draw information from this system to provide to the consultants, and how do they get information back in? How the consultant community can benefit from this database is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Contact information is submitted with lessons learned, so they can be contacted for clarification.

Notes and a guidebook are being built on how this database will be used.

Suggestions/Comments from the team:

- Categories: Add Permitting; Project Management; Traffic Control; Traffic Design. Add Local Agency and Developer Projects under Project Administration.

- Use broader categories with pull downs for subcategories. Use pull downs for category; don't let people type in their own category.

- Include search capabilities in the system.

- What kinds of things can be attached? Photos, pictures, videos, scanned documents – pdf. Any format of document can be saved with it.

- Cross reference to other categories – some submissions could be under more than one. It will be the gatekeeper's job to be sure they are categorized properly.

- Having both WSDOT and Consultant was questioned, but it was decided that they may both be needed.

  - Design: WSDOT/Consultant
  - Construction: WSDOT/Consultant

- New Record "Submitted" instead of New Record "Added." The new record won't be added until it is the submission is approved by the gatekeeper(s).

- Provide a quarterly report to provide external contact – both to and from. There needs to be a way to disseminate this information and to pull in lessons learned from outside WSDOT.

We need to find a way to ensure that people use and contribute to this database. Northwest Region is going to the project engineer/manager to provide these – they are responsible, so their name is the one that should be on it. It may be a pull-down list so any submission has a project engineer's name. It could be that it should include both the project engineer's name and the name of the person making the submission.

Within 2 weeks, it will be accessible on the server and information can be entered. The timeline for completion - up and running, guidebook, etc. - is June 2005. There will be a couple months of beta testing.

A suggestion was made to share this opportunity with the counties, etc. This can be done. Marketing this is one of our key activities. Ron has funding for this effort until June.

CaiCE Update
Ken Smith

The team looking into new integrated design software includes members of ACEC. They were working on a new program to replace CaiCE. We thought this was a good time to find out what is available and what will work for WSDOT.

We have taken InRoads to the next level within WSDOT. Several regions are doing active project testing on this program. InRoads is a proven product already. Although it looks like we're going to go with InRoads, we haven't made the final decision yet because we are trying to find out how it will interface with our other processes.

We want one platform – so we are leaning to Intergraph. Do you change your CADD software or your design software to work together. WSDOT is leaning heavily towards InRoads to work with MicroStation. Rather than a site license, we are working on an "enterprise leasing system" that is looking pretty good financially.

Autodesk is pushing us to test C3D (Civil 3D) along with InRoads. One of the reasons we are looking at InRoads comes from information we received from the consultants. Should we be looking at both of them?

A suggestion was made to give Autodesk an opportunity, but let them know they have to meet the timeline we are already working with. That way they can't delay the decision-making process. We have purchased a few copies of InRoads – we would need to do the same with C3D.

We haven't asked if there can be a discount provided to the consultant community.

Is there a chance that C3D will become prevalent in the consultant community?

We are looking at InRoads because it is developed around transportation design.

If you are starting a new project, press the question of what it should be developed in?

Pass on to ACEC that there is a change coming and they should contact Jon Bauer (360-709-8001) with questions. There is an ACEC member on the selection team. We are expecting to have clear direction by the first of the year and have some of the tools in place to begin our own new starts. How many of the projects in the pipeline can we transfer over and what kind of time will be lost?

Blue Ribbon Transportation Commission
Karl Winterstein

Website: http://ltc.leg.wa.gov/brct/

Handout: Final recommendations to the Governor and Legislature

Karl gave an overview of recommendations 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the 27 Blue Ribbon Transportation Commission recommendations. These are the ones most pertinent to project delivery.

Right of way banking is an interesting option – funding is the problem.

States that have taken over the 404 process are finding that it takes just as long as it did before and the state is paying for it instead of the federal government /Corps of Engineers. We are trying to work with the Corps of Engineers, but taking over the 404 process isn't a priority for us.

Rick Smith
Innovative Project Delivery Topics

We have funded a team that is working to secure permits. This Multi Agency Permit Team (MAP) is lead by WSDOT's Jason Smith who is working out of the Ecology Building.

The team includes the Corps of Engineers, Ecology, Wildlife, King County, and WSDOT. The projects they are working on are the first design-build project on I-405 and the Everett HOV projects. This experiment was suggested by Ecology.

To Do List:
- Supporting innovative project development and contracting.
- Implementing Design-Build.
  - Design Build Policy Group
  - Work with others in the agency who are doing design-build
  - Interested in other innovative project delivery methods both here and in other states
- Promoting innovative delivery methods – knowing what is out there and developing policy on how our agency wants to apply these methods.
- Figure out how we can do design-build for some of the specialty projects that we currently aren't allowed to use it for.
- Multi Agency Permit Team.
- Simplify the 4F process.
  - This is a "biggie"
  - Figure out how to combine it with Section 406
- There are different Corps of Engineer requirements in different parts of the country. This is a fact. We try to bring some of these things back and talk to

Tom Mueller at the Corps about them. We are asking for a document that specifies the legal requirements for every step of the process. They have to start to understand processes that are unique to Washington.

- Right of Way
  - o Headquarters Right of Way and regions (especially Northwest Region Right of Way) have urgent delivery needs. There are monthly meetings with Amir Rasaie and John Jensen to facilitate communication and gather ideas on how to deal with right of way. Administrative settlement authority is now in the regions. In some regions there is a higher level of administrative offers.
  - o How do you streamline appraisal review? This is a big problem for some regions.
  - o Turnkey right of way consulting contracts seem to be working pretty well. We are developing performance measures.
  - o Right of way plan and access review process.
    - Right of way plan development
    - Right of way plan review
    - Trying to get some uniformity
    - Scan right of way plans to develop an electronic database.
      - Utilizing GIS with this scanned database would be a major step forward.
        - o InRoads has an excellent auxiliary that could help with this.
    - Getting closer to electronic signatures on these plans.
      - Pilot is about to launch.
  - o Questions: Does WSDOT have the appropriate staffing level?
    - No. We don't have enough staff and it is difficult to recruit because of the pay scale. Northwest Region has supplemented their workforce using consultants. Eastern Region has supplemented their appraisal process with consultants. We have a hard time finding interested consultants for smaller projects with only a few parcels.
    - We have made good progress in working with WSDOT to develop ROW plans the way the reviewer is going to want to see them.
      - ROW plan preparation is getting the right people with the right expertise to prepare the plan – experience level is important.
  - o Utilities
    - We are working with some regional staff to facilitate earlier communication with utilities on our projects. This started a year ago when we got the Nickel package. We are mainly getting people to sit down and understand what we have going on and what is coming.
  - o Subsurface Utility Engineering
    - Used in some areas
    - Are there standards we need to develop?

- How do we describe what we need?
  - Specialty consultants to do utility coordination
  - GIS – web-based permit applications for utilities
  - Project teams that own the project and stick with the project throughout its life, instead of specialty teams that pass it on.
    - Implementing MPD
  - Agreements
    - This is an area that can use improvement.
    - We are working with Headquarters and the regions to research how these are working across the state.
      - Standardizing
      - Whom to go to
      - Eliminate some of the review stages
      - Statewide effort, including UCO, AG, etc.
      - Database to keep track of agreements that are out there
      - Railroad agreements are at the table too
  - Scoping
    - Needs to work better. It doesn't work uniformly in each region
    - Many scopes are 10 years old
    - Uniformity; money to pay for it; where does it go?
    - CEVP/CRA – good estimating tools
  - Implementing lessons learned program
  - Laser scanning
    - Viable for some aspects of work
    - Need to find funding
    - Surveying – laser technology that picks up points and maps out contours
    - Very powerful tool
    - Picks up 3-dimensional information
    - Relatively new technology
    - Looking at making it an available service

Venues for this group:
Regarding right of way, we talked about what we're doing in practice vs. legal   We need to look at what we really need to do legally as a baseline and see if there are any efficiencies. State requirements are the problem.

Action Item: *Keith Metcalf will meet with the Eastern Region Real Estate Manager to determine what his frustrations are regarding requirements that are not legal requirements. Rick Smith will determine what his committee is finding with regard to this.*

Sales Tax Implications for Project Delivery Cost and Draft Change Request
Duncan Findlay

Draft change request: Washington State sales tax – construction projects are taxed differently. On county or city projects, sales tax is levied only on the materials component. WSDOT project tax is added to everything at the end at 8.5%. So the same, identical project would cost WSDOT more than a county or city. Why are cities and counties treated differently than WSDOT?

A suggestion was made to ask for an exemption from sales tax for WSDOT projects and to also make an exemption in the excise tax. Rick commented that they are going to raise the design-build sales tax issue informally with the legislature this year. Rick and/or Ken Smith can bring up this issue also.

Action Items
- Read through the Draft Change Request 2 (sales tax). Return any revisions or edits that are appropriate and note whether it should go forward to our sponsors.
  (All team members)

- Review the advance copy of WSDOT Design Manual Chapter 140 (MPD), which includes revisions (handout). Question for next meeting: Are you following this process or a different process? How well is it working for you? Bring examples if appropriate – risk matrix or project management plan.
  (All team members)

- APDR

  o Look at what other states are doing.
    (Rick Smith)

  o Develop ideas for draft APDR recommendation to help in negotiations with FHWA. What do we and don't we want? What changes are we trying to make?
    (All team members)

  o Look at parallel processes. Find efficiencies within each one and then try to compress them together.
    (All team members)

  o Put APDR Steps for Success on the Access website:
    http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/eesc/design/access/ She will also add Chapter 1425 to the beginning of the APDR timeline so people know what is necessary to get to the timeline.
    (Darlene Sharar)

- Right of way

- o Keith Metcalf will meet with the Eastern Region Real Estate Manager to determine what his frustrations are regarding state requirements that are not legal requirements.
  (Keith Metcalf)
- o Rick Smith will determine what his committee is finding with regard to state vs. legal right of way requirements.
  (Rick Smith)

Next Meeting
Friday, November 5, 2004, in Tacoma/Olympia area. Check the website for specific information, directions, and agenda.

Draft Agenda and Action Items
- Review Change Recommendation #1
  - o Checklist for intersection plans
- Review Change Recommendation #2
  - o Discussion
- Managing Project Delivery Discussion
- Project management practices
- APDR timeline efficiencies
- Right of Way process – Keith, Rick, Amir, Pasco